



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

he deemed best and most serviceable for the construction of an independent system. Only in his case Leibnitz's genius was lacking. Of the three dominant schools at Platner's time—the rationalistic, the empirical, and sceptical—Leibnitz and Kant were the representatives of the first, Gottlob Ernst Schulze (*Aenesidemus*) of the third, and Tetens of the second. After that of Leibnitz and Kant, Tetens's influence on Platner is greatest. A consideration of the philosophies of all these men, therefore, is incorporated by Dr. Wreschner in his book.

Platner being admittedly an unoriginal thinker, and one who has not contributed any prominent feature to the physiognomy of the world's thought, it might be remarked that learned and laborious discussions of his relations to contemporary philosophers are a waste of time and mental energy. But this is not Dr. Wreschner's opinion. According to him, it is only by a study of the average minds of an age that its true character and tendencies can be determined; in fact, without this help, even its foremost minds cannot be justly estimated. μκρκ.

PHILOSOPHY AND POLITICAL ECONOMY IN SOME OF THEIR HISTORICAL RELATIONS.

By *James Bonar, M. A., LL. D.* London: Swan Sonnenschein & Co. New York: Macmillan & Co. 1893.

The work of the Library of Philosophy is rapidly pushing forward. Besides Erdmann's general work on the "History of Philosophy" three other historical treatises have now been published, dealing respectively with ethics, theology, and (the present work) economics. A long list is marked as "in preparation," among them, on this subject, being "The History of Political Philosophy," by Mr. D. G. Ritchie, whose work, "Darwin and Hegel," is reviewed in this *Monist*.

Dr. Bonar's work, a contribution to the second series of the library, or the department which treats of the history of particular theories, is a portly, well-indexed volume of four hundred and ten pages, the publishers' work of which is excellent, and which the author has much increased in value by adding an introduction, a summary, and a good table of contents. Dr. Bonar's work in the proportions in which it is here undertaken, is a new and unattempted one, only monographs, limited to special periods, having hitherto been written on this subject. The idea of the book—that of tracing the connexions of economical and philosophical ideas throughout the whole of their history—was suggested to Dr. Bonar by a remark of Prof. Adolph Wagner of Berlin.

The author first takes up Ancient Philosophy, and deals with Plato, Aristotle, the Stoics and Epicureans, and Christianity, treating of the idea of wealth, production and distribution, and civil society in these systems. The characteristic of Ancient Philosophy in this respect is that the ancient philosophers treated more fully of economical topics than modern philosophers do, the reason being that the two disciplines, philosophy and economics, were originally not separated. But although subsequently direct economic discussion occupies a proportionately smaller space in philosophical works, on the other hand the consideration of the philosophical roots

of economical ideas is much more thoroughly treated. This is the characteristic of the later period. With Book II, on Natural Law, the discussions of modern philosophy begin. Here Machiavelli, More, Bodin, Grotius, Hobbes, Harrington, Locke, Hume, the Physiocrats, and Adam Smith are treated. In Book III the doctrines of Malthus, Bentham, the two Mills (the Utilitarian Economists); in Book IV, those of Kant, Fichte, Krause, Hegel (the Idealistic Economists); in Book V, those of Karl Marx, Engels, Lassalle (the Materialistic Economists), and the Evolutionists, are discussed. In modern times, we find, political economy grows out of political philosophy. The mercantile theory was essentially political; so were Hobbes's and Locke's theories of property. Even afterwards, when economical subjects were ethically discussed by Mandeville, Hutcheson, and Hume, the systems of Smith and the French economists were the outgrowth of political considerations. The philosophical, or rather metaphysical, notion of natural law, and its later offspring, the rights of man, persists even in the economical works of to-day. Finally, in modern socialism, philosophical and economical problems, before only tacitly connected, are now openly combined. With respect to the psychological element in economics, it may be mentioned that this has only recently been emphasised, although beginnings of it are noticeable in ancient philosophy, and are well marked, for instance, in Hume.

One word with regard to the influence of Darwinism, and we close. Dr. Bonar believes that the effect of the doctrine of natural selection is not especially to favor socialism, or, for that matter, any particular plan of social reform. The development of the individual members of society is the chief end of society and the state; as long as human nature remains what it is, the state must exist. But as each individual must use the opportunities assured by the State in his own way, also great individual liberty must be secured; whatever change may be made in the statute laws of property, room must yet be left for personal and moral freedom, for originality, for individual variation: if it is not, mankind will be the losers. *μκρκ.*